



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/401,080 09/22/99 SHIKAMA

T 36856.00218

MMC2/0607

JOSEPH R KEATING ESQ
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
GRAHAM & JAMES LLP
14TH FLOOR 801 SOUTH FIGUEROA
LOS ANGELES CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2832

DATE MAILED:

06/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or
proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/401,080

Applicant(s)

Shikama et al.

Examiner
Tuyen T. Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2832



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2, 5 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, what does applicant intend by “each of the coils has different electrical characteristics?” Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 5, the term “substantially” is a relative term.

Regarding claim 9, the phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different number of windings from that of others of the plurality of coils” is unclear. Does applicant intend for the number of turns of the coils to be different? There is no antecedent basis for “coils” in lines 2 and 3. Applicant should clarify.

Art Unit: 2832

Regarding claim 10, the phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different thickness from that of others of the plurality of coils” is unclear. There is no antecedent basis for “coils” in lines 2 and 3. Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 11, the phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different diameter from that of others of the plurality of coils. “Different diameter” of what does applicant intend. There is no antecedent basis for “coils” in lines 2 and 3. Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 12, line 4, applicant should clarify what is intended by “close-coupled coils.” Claims 13-20 inherit the defect of the parent claim.

Regarding claim 14, there is no antecedent basis for “the plurality of coils.” The phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different number of windings from that of others of the plurality of coils” is unclear. Does applicant intend the number of turns of the coils to be different? Applicant should clarify [note, from figures 9, 11, and 13, this structure does not show the coils having different number of turns.]

Regarding claim 15, there is no antecedent basis for “the plurality of coils.” The phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different thickness from that of others of the plurality of coils” is unclear [note, from figures 9, 11, and 13, this structure does not show the coils having different thickness.] Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 16, there is no antecedent basis for “one of the plurality of coils.” The phrase “one of the plurality of coils has a different diameter from that of others of the plurality of coils” is

Art Unit: 2832

unclear [note, from figures 9, 11, and 13, this structure does not show the coils having wire conductors in different diameters.] Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 18, what does applicant intend by “each of the coils has different electrical characteristics?” Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 19, applicant states that “wherein four of the coils are provided” [note from figures 9, 11 and 13, this does not appear to be the case.] Applicant should clarify.

Regarding claim 20, the term “substantially” is a relative term

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mamada et al. [JP 9-246080].

Mamada et al. discloses a composite inductor element [see figure 6] comprising:

- a rectangular parallelepiped shaped block [1] made of at least either resin or rubber having a magnetic material dispersed therein;

- U-shaped external electrodes [4₁-4₄] made of one of Ag, Ag-Pd, and Ni being provided on said rectangular parallelepiped shaped block; and

Art Unit: 2832

- four spirally wound coils [2a₁-2a₄] buried in said rectangular parallelepiped shaped block, wherein end portions of each of the four spirally wound coils being electrically connected to said external electrodes, and wherein the four spirally wound coils are arranged such that axes of the four spirally wound coils extend in the same direction.

6. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mamada et al. [US 5,692,290].

Mamada et al. discloses a composite inductor element [see figures 1A and 1B] comprising:

- a rectangular parallelepiped shaped block [1] made of at least either resin or rubber having a magnetic material dispersed therein;

- a plurality of electromagnetically “close-coupled” coils [1a-1d] buried in said block; wherein said coils being arranged in parallel and being constructed of spirally-wound parallel-wire lines made of a plurality of insulation-coated conductors.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Imada et al. [JP 5-326270]; Imada [JP 5-326271 and JP 5-326272]; Makino et al. [JP 5-152130]; Ikeda [US 5,132,650]; Tokuda [US 5,578,981]; Okubo [US 5,583,470]; and Mamada et al. [US 5,821,843].

-

Art Unit: 2832

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Tuyen T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-0821.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Gellner, can be reached at (703)308-1721. The fax number for this Group is (703)305-1341.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

TTN TTN

Art Unit 2832

June 5, 2000


LINCOLN DONOVAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100